RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 1 7 2006

## Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-8 are pending in this application, and are rejected in the final Office Action of May 17, 2006. No claim amendments are presented in this response. However, a listing of the current claims is included for the Examiner's convenience.

Rejection of claims 1-2 and 4-8 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Han (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,094) in view of Fujimoto (U.S. Patent No. 5,912,710)

Applicant submits that claims 1-2 and 4-8 are patentably distinguishable over the teachings of Han and Fujimoto for at least the following reasons.

Applicant first notes that independent claims 1 and 6 include:

"means for generating an On Screen Display (OSD) signal for forming a graphics display that is overlaid onto one of the first and second video programs, the generating means capable of providing the OSD signal in any one of the first and second color formats, wherein the generated OSD signal is formatted in accordance with a selected one of the first and second color format that corresponds to a color format associated with the selected video signal, the generating means comprising

- a color palette that includes color information formatted in accordance with a predetermined color format, and
- a plurality of color conversion matrices for converting the color information in the color palette to provide the OSD signal, which is formatted in accordance with the selected one of the first and second color format (emphasis added; see claim 1), and

"providing a plurality of color conversion matrices, wherein each color conversion matrix is adapted to convert the color information in the color palette to provide a graphics signal that is formatted in accordance with a particular color format, wherein said plurality of color conversion matrices enables providing graphics signals in any one of the first and second color formats;

selecting a desired one of the plurality of color conversion matrices that corresponds to the selected video signal source and generating a graphics signal for forming a graphics display that is overlaid onto the video programs, the graphics signal being formatted in accordance with one of the first color signal format

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 1 7 2006

and the second color signal format that corresponds to a color format associated with the selected video signal' (emphasis added; see claim 6)

As indicated above, independent claim 1 define an apparatus comprising means for generating an On Screen Display (OSD) signal for forming a graphics display that is overlaid onto one of first and second video programs. generating means is capable of providing the OSD signal in any one of first and second color formats, and the generated OSD signal is formatted in accordance with a selected one of the first and second color formats that corresponds to a color format associated with a selected one of first and second video signals representative of the first and second video programs, respectively. In other words, the generating means of claim 1 is capable of providing the OSD signal in more than one color format (i.e., in either the first color format or the second color format). Independent claim 6 defines a method of producing graphics comprising a step of providing a graphics signal for forming a graphics display that is overlaid onto video programs. The graphics signal is formatted in accordance with one of a first color signal format and a second color signal format that corresponds to a color format associated with a selected video signal. In other words, the graphics signal of claim 6 is capable of being provided in more than one color signal format (i.e., in either the first color signal format or the second color signal format).

Neither Han nor Fujimoto, whether taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest, *inter alla*, the ability to provide an OSD or graphics signal in more than one color format, as claimed. In formulating the instant rejection, the Examiner relies on Han for allegedly disclosing a "data converter 151 capable of providing the OSD signal in any one of the first and second color formats" (see page 4 of the final Office Action dated May 17, 2006). However, Han's data converter 151 is not capable of providing signals in more than one color format. In particular, Han states:

"The data converter 151 converts the read OSD data having a YCbCr color format of 4:4:4, 4:2:2, or 4:2:0 into one uniform YCbCr color format of 4:4:4 and outputs the converted data to the MUX 153." (emphasis added; see column 4, lines 43-47)

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 1 7 2006

Accordingly, it is clear from the foregoing of passage of Han that data converter 151 is capable of converting signals into only "one uniform YCbCr color format of 4:4:4" and not into more than color format, as claimed. Fujimoto is unable to remedy this deficiency of Han. In particular, Fujimoto is cited for allegedly teaching an RGB color palette circuit that converts pixel data into RGB color data. However, even assuming, arguendo, that Fujimoto provides the cited teachings, it fails to teach or suggest, inter alia, the ability to provide an OSD or graphics signal in more than one color format, as claimed. Therefore, in view of the foregoing clarification, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-2 and 4-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

## Rejection of claim 3 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Han (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,094) in view of Fujimoto (U.S. Patent No. 5,912,710), and further in view of Susumu Imai (JP 403268594)

Susumu Imai is cited for allegedly teaching a conversion matrix for converting R,G,B components into Y,I,Q components. However, Susumu Imai fails to remedy the deficiencies of Han and Fujimoto presented above in conjunction with independent claims 1 and 6. That is, Susumu Imai fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, the ability to provide an OSD or graphics signal in more than one color format, as claimed. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 3 is patentably distinguishable over the combination of Han, Fujimoto and Susumu Imai, and respectfully requests withdraw of the rejection.

## Conclusion

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6815, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 17 2006

Respectfully submitted, Charles Bailey Neal

By:

Paul P. Kiel

Attorney for Applicant Registration No. 40.677

THOMSON Licensing Inc. PO Box 5312 Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: August 17, 2006

## CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia, 22313-1450 on:

20-17-8

Date

Administrator Name

Karen Schlaue